



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,428	03/01/2004	William E. Adams	030655	9794
23464	7590	10/06/2005	EXAMINER	
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL, P.C. ONE OXFORD CENTRE, 301 GRANT STREET 20TH FLOOR PITTSBURGH, PA 15219			WILLIAMS, MARK A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3676	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/790,428	ADAMS	
	Examiner Mark A. Williams	Art Unit 3676	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, with respect to “configured for reattachment to the back side... by a second distance different from the first distance”, it is unclear what is intended to be claimed in the context of the invention. Is this second distance measured from the “back side” surface or from the “spacer” surface? It would appear from applicant’s drawings, as in figures 3 and 4, that this would be the spacer surface, but the claim seems to suggest it is the back side surface. This is true also in regards to claims 2 and 15.

In claim 10, it is unclear what the “locking member” is in the context of the invention and how it functions relative to other aspects of the invention. In addition, it is unclear if applicant intended for adhesive or the locking member to be used to secure the spacer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pelavin, US Patent 3,907,118, in view of US Publication Document 2002/0144962 A1 to Dettorre et al. Pelavin discloses a door hook to be extended over a door top to both sides of a door, the door hook comprising a U-shaped bracket 11 having a top member 17, a front side 19 which is attached to one edge of the top member, and a back side 18 which is attached to an other edge of the top member opposite the one edge, wherein the front side and back side are separated by a first distance; a hook member 33 attached to the front side; and a spacer portion 22, the spacer portion being attached to the U-shaped bracket and configured for attachment to the back side such that the back side with the spacer portion attached thereto and the front side are separated by a second distance different from the first distance. The second distance is less than the first distance. The bracket is of metal and can be formed of plastic as well; a tab or finger is attached to the spacer.

Pelavin discloses the claimed invention except for teaching the spacer portion being detachable for reattachment, as claimed. Dettorre teaches such a detachable spacer 27 by means of a threaded member or snap-fitting engagement. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made for one skilled in the art to have included in the design of Pelavin such a modification, as generally taught by Dettorre, for the purpose of providing a means for removably attaching the spacer to the bracket.

5. Claims 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pelavin in view of Dettorre. Although the particular means of fastening the spacer to the bracket are not explicitly taught by the combination, the examiner serves Official Notice that it is known in the art of fasteners to utilize various types of means to join to members in a desired fashion, including double sided tape and adhesives. Such structure is considered functionally equivalent. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify the device in this way for the purpose of providing an alternative means of fastening the spacer in a desired manner that would have functional equally as well.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pelavin in view of Dettorre. Although an acute angle is not explicitly taught, it would have

been an obvious matter of design choice to make the different portions of the device of whatever form or shape was desired or expedient. A change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent any showing of unexpected results. *In re Dailey et al.*, 149 USPQ 47. Such a modification is not critical to the design and would have produced no unexpected results.

6. Claims 5, 15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pelavin in view of Dettorre, and in further view of Gregory et al., US Patent 5,515,981. The combination does not explicitly teach the bracket and the spacer being molded adjacent the back side, as claimed. It is well known to mold and product in such a manner. Gregory teaches the generally concept of molding different parts adjacent one another for creating a desired end product. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made for one skilled in the art to have modified the design of the combination to include such a modification, as generally taught by Gregory, for the purpose of creating a desired end product by a process of molding.

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pelavin in view of Dettorre. The combination discloses the claimed invention except for explicit teaching of the particular range claimed. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to the device in such a way, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. Such a modification is not critical to the design and would have produced no unexpected results.

8. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pelavin in view of Dettorre. The combination discloses the claimed invention except for the second hook, as claimed. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device in this way, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8. Such a modification is not critical to the design and would have produced no unexpected results.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 9, 12, 13, and 16 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. New art has been applied after reconsideration of the previous rejection.

Conclusion

This action is non-final.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark A. Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-7064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark Williams
9/29/05



Suzanne Dino Barrett
Primary Examiner